



STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION STAFF LEGISLATIVE BILL ANALYSIS

Date Amended:	January 10, 2000	Bill No:	SB 843
Tax:	Administration	Author:	Polanco
Board Position:		Related Bills:	AB 1686 (Com. on Info. Tech.), Ch. 873, Statutes of 1999

BILL SUMMARY:

This bill would change the name of the Department of Information Technology to the Information Technology Agency. This bill would enact the Information Technology Management Act of 1999, for the purpose of improving and strengthening the state's existing information technology management practices.

ANALYSIS:

Current Law:

Existing Law, Section 11700 of the Government Code, establishes the Department of Information Technology (DOIT) as an independent state agency that reports directly to the Governor. The DOIT is managed by a director, also known as the Chief Information Officer (CIO), who is appointed by the Governor.

The DOIT provides statewide guidance to state agencies regarding the successful use and implementation of information technology. Legislation provides for the operation of the DOIT to sunset on July 1, 2002.

Proposed Law:

This bill would change the name of the DOIT to the Information Technology Agency (ITA) and change the name of the director to the Information Technology Agency Secretary and Chief Information Officer.

This bill would add Chapter 7.5 (commencing with Section 11790) to Part 1 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code, which would be known as the "Information Technology Management Act (ITMA) of 1999." As used in this chapter, "agency secretary" means the ITA Secretary and Chief Information Officer. The ITMA would establish practices to enable state agencies to improve the management of their information technology systems. Among other things, the ITMA would:

This staff analysis is provided to address various administrative, cost, revenue and policy issues; it is not to be construed to reflect or suggest the Board's formal position.

- Require state agencies, upon the advice of the agency secretary, to designate a department or agency chief information officer to advise the head of the state agency on the design, development, and implementation of information technology systems. State agencies would establish an interagency support structure in order to work with other agencies in the development of information technology procedures and standards.
- Require the head of each state agency to (1) determine whether an investment in new information technology is warranted, (2) align information technology investments with agency plans and priorities, (3) participate in the interagency support structure, and (4) improve information technology performance and service to the public.
- Require the ITA to establish a Chief Information Officers Council (CIO Council) to serve as the principle interagency forum for state agencies. The CIO Council would develop recommendations for the overall management of state agencies information technology policies, procedures, standards, and assess and address the area of human resources in the area of information technology. The CIO Council would be (1) composed of state agency CIOs and the deputy CIOs of state agencies, (2) chaired by the agency secretary, and (3) the vice-chair would be a state agency CIO and elected by the CIO Council on a rotating basis.
- Require the agency secretary to (1) oversee a state agency's development, implementation, acquisition, use, and disposal of information technology, (2) provide clear and concise directions to the head of each state agency to ensure the effective use of information technology systems, (3) "...take any authorized action that he or she considers appropriate, including an action involving the budgetary process or appropriations management process, to enforce the accountability of the head of a state agency for information technology resources management and for the investments made by the state agency in information technology," (4) assess and compare the performances of the state agencies in using information technology and disseminate the information to the heads of the state agencies, and (5) keep the Governor and Legislature informed on the progress of how state agencies are improving and accomplishing the performance of agency programs and the accomplishment of agency missions through the use of information technology resources management.

BACKGROUND:

- SB 1 (Alquist) Chapter 508, Statutes of 1995, replaced the Office of Information Technology with the Department of Information Technology.
- AB 1686 (Committee on Information Technology), Chapter 873, Statutes of 1999, among other things, makes the DOIT a permanent government entity and extends the dates on which the provisions are to become inoperative to July 1, 2002.

This staff analysis is provided to address various administrative, cost, revenue and policy issues; it is not to be construed to reflect or suggest the Board's formal position.

COMMENTS:

1. **Sponsor and intent.** This bill is sponsored by the author's office, who has indicated that this bill is intended to strengthen the state's information technology management practices and increase the authority of the CIO.
2. **This bill would delete the requirement for an Information Technology advisory committee**, but would instead establish a Chief Information Officers Council composed of state agency CIOs and deputy CIOs to serve as the interagency forum to improve state agency practices and performance in the area of information technology.
3. **The January 10, 2000, amendments do not affect our previous analysis.** Current amendments to the bill (1) makes minor technical changes (i.e., replacing "department" with "agency") and (2) eliminates the provision that would have extended the operative date of the Information Technology Agency to July 1, 2005.

COST ESTIMATE:

There are no identifiable costs to the Board to comply with the provisions in this bill.

REVENUE ESTIMATE:

No impact.

Analysis prepared by:	Susan P. Lawrence	322-4776	February 2, 2000
Contact:	Margaret S. Shedd	322-2376	

0843-2sl.doc

This staff analysis is provided to address various administrative, cost, revenue and policy issues; it is not to be construed to reflect or suggest the Board's formal position.